1º	E	7C87		
HUL	1,8	2004	CORNER	

\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	<u>'} </u>					
JUN 1 8 2004	Applicat	nt/Attorney Int	erview Sun	nmary		
Application No.	9/652,766	First Named Appl	cant: Douglas	Gourlay, et al.		
Examiner: Lee, Philip C. Art Unit: 2154 Status of Application: Pending						
Participants: (1)	Douglas Gourlay	Examiner	(2) Marc S.	Hanish, Reg. No	<u>o. 42,626</u>	
(3)_		(4)				
Date of Interview	: June 8, 2004	Time:	12:30 p.m.			
Type of Interview (a) [X] Telephonic		(b) [] Personal		(c) [] Video B	ECEIVED	
		[] YES [X]		Tec	JUN 2 3 2004 hnology Center 21	
		Issues Disc	ussed			
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Disc	ussed Agreed	Not Agreed	
(1) <u>Rej</u>		Emens	_ []	[X] [] []	[] [] []	
	neet Attached	[] Copy of Draft A				
Substance of Inter agreement was re		escription of the ge er comments:	neral nature (of what was agre	eed to if an	
Applicant describe could be read to in indicating that it is	clude content requ	lid not apply. Examest in Emons. Appleransit time.	iner felt broad icant agreed to	interpretation of modify "query"	word "query" to a term	
A complete written state	ment as to the substanc	nterview Must be Made of e of any face-to-face, video cation whether or not an a	conference, or tele	ephone interview with Examiner was reached	regard to an d at the interview.	
reasons presented at the necessity too reply to O	interview as warrantin	ested in view of an intervieg favorable action must be n §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.	filed be the Applic	er, a complete written eant. An interview doo	statement of the es not remove the	